

RB, M, HR, GRS, MT, Jan W.

10/14/70

Dear Paul,

Before writing the enclosed, letter to Physics Today I waited for meaningful response from you for six weeks. The single thing you sent me is demeaning to you and insulting to and abusive of me. It is utterly unconscionable of you to seek detailed comment on your work, pretendedly seriously, and then to dismiss those things I wrote which, it must be obvious, you cannot refute, with the spurious concern for my ulcer which, to the best of your knowledge, has not troubled me at all-ever.

When I ask you to show me a single validity in your so-called test, and you do no, I insist because you cannot, is not self-characterization when you say no more than that you will not "argue" with me? When I asked you for two copies of your opus so that I might submit them to competent scientific evaluation, you wait three weeks to send them and then under circumstances that cause them to spend three weeks in transit. When I ask you for the address of Physics Today so I can write and ask for simultaneous and equal response you to this day haven't responded. And I could go on and on.

I have a few minutes while waiting for fog to lift so I can go on a short chore. I use them not to debate with you but for any other purpose: to ask you to evaluate yourself and what you have done and are party to-and why.

I begin with the concept: of all the things to which you could devote your considerable knowledge and fine intelligence why pick on what you freely acknowledge can and will be used for dishonest purposes, what cannot be used other than wrongly and to the detriment of what you and so many of your friends have labored so long and at such great cost to try and bring to light, the truth. If you can show me any legitimate use of this wretched thing other than a fictitious defense of the Warren Report, please do so. If you cannot, ask yourself why you are party to such a project.

Your discipline is one of precision. It requires exactitude in expression, faithfulness in duplication, verisimilitude in tests. I repeat the old challenge, that you show me a single faithfully-reproduced condition in your "tests", a single undistorted representation of them in your commentary. Ask yourself further what you would do if you were teaching high-school science and a student turned in such a project to you. Not a doctoral candidate, with his undergraduate work past, his orals completed, but an immature kid. How would you regard this "test" coming from an immature child?

Ask yourself why you used the wrong rifle, in itself total disqualification, undescribed ammo (again, total disqualification), when both an M-C and military ammo was readily available from me if not also from Nichols and Bernebel? As a physicist, compare a velocity of at least a third more, a projectile of not less than ten times added weight, and tell me they are in any way comparable.

Ask yourself if in physics or any other science you can equate the reactions of attached and unattached objects to a bullet. The same about the presence and the absence of bone (even CBS used Masonite for it).

Why did you not duplicate the steep downward angle? Why, instead, did you make up an undescribed upward angle?

When you found a different reaction with gelatin, why did you abandon that? Ignore it? Or, why did you not fill melons with it?

Ask yourself about the timing, even if (or especially because) it is

Have you faithfully represented what Zapruder shows? When I told you I have a clearer copy and another, very clear film, you did not ask ~~xxxxxx~~ me what is visible in them. Why? Can it be because your mind was fixed and could brook no disproof?

Why did you select work of known error for your straw man?

Of the so-called "double hit" theories, as you know there are two, not one, neither Thompson's. The one he uses he got from Ray Marcus, to my knowledge (and Ray and I are not even speaking), for Ray came to see me at that time and told me of it, before cold weather in 1966, before Link was working on a book. The second is mine, which postulates a hit, not necessarily to the head, from the back, and not as close as Z312. But ask yourself, do you really address either?

If, as you say, there is no proof of a hit from the front, I defy you to give me any single irrefutable, probative proof of one from the back and to the head. So what are you up to?

You deny Alvarez pressure on you. Then explain to me your untruthfulness in describing what has come to be called the "jiggle theory" as "his discovery" when you are among those who called it to his attention from WHITEWASH (47)?

Why do you misrepresent the spray and fragment pattern? Or ignore where fragments were, definitely, found?

What was the need for reloading the wrong ammo, and then not describing it?

Or of using the wrong rifle?

Can you compare the reaction of melon tissue, of whatever species, ripe or green, of whatever size, with that of skin, human tissue, numerous bones?

Can you say what kind of ammo or ammos were used in the assassination, or what rifle(s)? If not, how can you conduct a valid test? Can you do any better with angles, regardless of direction? Can you possibly believe, on the basis of what you read (without disputing it) in FM III, that full-jacketed military ammo was then used?

Why do you call a violent motion of the entire body a "head snap"? As a physicist, can you say these are identical descriptions? Or that identical forces or even causes are involved? Have you any basis for valid time measurements, and if not, have you any valid basis for any calculations? Do you distinguish between the three, discontinuous head and body motions, or do you ignore one and treat the other two as a single one? (Events beyond-rejuvenation typewriter rebels!)

Can you, with any semblance of integrity, intellectual or scientific, divorce this "study" from everything else you know, pretend it can be examined separately from other knowledge? How, for example, can you reconcile this with total lack of reference to Teguer or Hoover's definitive comment on what could and could not have caused that injury? How can you separate this from the bastard single-bullet theory? Or the suppression of the spectro (I have no clear copy of the government's response to distribute).

Knowing what you were up to, how can you reconcile this with the very brief time you spent here when you were for so long so close, with your failure to ask of me what relevant evidence I could show you? Surely you know I've had no secrets from you. Did you even ask to examine the new picture I have, which are quite relevant, or my file of panel correspondence, which is certainly relevant?

In the past I have often asked your critical comment of my work, and I am in your debt for the errors you caught and the time you took. It is my impression that although I am and always have been busier than you, I have in each case made response to each suggestion I did not accept. If it was a joke, it was a poor one, but if that miserable shit about concern for my ulcer was serious, how can you explain it to yourself? The only way I found out I had an ulcer was when tests were made for something else. I healed it without knowing I had it. It has bothered me but a single time after that, when irritating medication was supplied for a mechanical medical problem. Is your response worthy of a child?

I take this time because I was and am serious in my expression of concern for you and what this will do to you, now and in the future. One of the things I'd strongly encourage you to do (and it is difficult) is to try and detach yourself and evaluate what you have done, then ask yourself why. We all have problems, we all have hangups, and they can all color our thinking and our work. Have you problems that have expressed themselves in this? Perhaps personal problems, which are often difficult to cope with, even sometimes to comprehend? I take this time also because of the regard I have always had for you. I do not take time for polished, diplomatic expression, for that is not proper between friend, where candor is the minimum requirement of friendship. I also speak from more than twice your experience with life and its problems.

Publication of this rotten, evil prostitution of the intellect and of science will hurt us all, but we'll survive it. The real question I have is will you? Unless you are some kind of fink or whore, how will you regard yourself when the consequences you yourself anticipate come to pass?

Do you think so little of the regard of those who have been your friends that, for whatever you may see in them you would throw that away for publication of what is at best meaningless, real fairies and needles stuff, and what is at worst enough to validate serious charges, if not beliefs, about you and your personal and professional integrity?

I'd be interested in knowing who has supported you in all of this. I was careful to distribute no copies of what I sent you six weeks ago until after those few to whom I sent it had first reached and communicated their own conclusions. Not one has indicated any sympathy for your thing, and several have gone out of their ways to let me know they really understated their real opinions, not to offend you.

While ill, and I'm not yet well, I reread 1984. Especially now do I urge you to. You have manufactured an excellent example of doubleplusgood duck speak. Whether or not you seek it, you will have Big Brother's approbation.

And I must ask you to ask yourself why Alvarez comes up with these sycopaentic notions just at the time the government is in greatest distress. Why did it take four and a half years for him to get interested in the first publication of what he now pretends to be interested in in head motion? Accident only? How much of his pre- and post-Hiroshima drop it career is federally financed? Can you totally ignore such considerations? Or whatever, if any, compulsions he feels as a consequence of urging and defending that unequaled and totally unnecessary barbarity? I think it is time to ask a question we may not expect to answer, what are his connections? What are his political beliefs? And for you to face the reasons for your inclusion of so much political crap in your "scientific study", esp. on Garrison, who could not possibly have been more irrelevant!

Deeply troubled,